DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 556 CG 012 633

AUTHOR Finlayson, Harry J.
TITLE The Effect of Nonpromotion Upon the Self Concept of Pupils in Primary Grades.
PUB DATE Oct 75
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Failure; *Age Grade Placement; Elementary School Students; Elementary School Teachers; *Grade Repetition; Immaturity; *Parent Attitudes; Parent Student Relationship; *Primary Education; Research Projects; *Self Concept; Self Esteem; *Student Promotion; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *FACES Scale

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study was to explore the effect of non-promotion on the self concept of pupils in public elementary schools. First graders (N=585) from Montgomery County, Pennsylvania were administered the FACES self concept scale at two different times during the 1973-1974 school year. Of these first graders, 25 non-promoted pupils, 25 randomly selected promoted pupils and 25 "borderline" pupils were administered the FACES scale at two different times during the 1974-1975 school year. A parent questionnaire, an in-depth parent interview and two teacher questionnaires were also administered to the teachers and parents of the non-promoted children to secure opinions bearing on the non-promoted pupils' self concepts and the effect of non-promotion on the children's self concepts. It is concluded that: (1) non-promotion appears to have no effect on the self concept of first grade children; (2) despite the fact of non-promotion, the self concepts of the non-promoted group continue to increase during the repeated school year while the self concepts of the borderline and promoted groups tend to decrease; (3) self concept scores of the three promotion groups do not significantly differ at the beginning and end of the study; (4) both parents and teachers see their non-promoted children's self concepts as positive and as becoming more positive or remaining stable after non-promotion. (Author/RF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED155556

THE EFFECT OF NONPROMOTION UPON THE SELF CONCEPT OF PUPILS IN PRIMARY GRADES

by

Harry John Finlayson

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. J. Finlayson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A Dissertation Abstract
Submitted to
the Temple University Graduate Board
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education
October 1975

CG 012633

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

Recent research indicates an important relationship between a pupil's self concept and his achievement. Being identified as a failure by the school environment may impede his future achievement and self esteem. Whether a poor self concept contributes to school failure or whether school failure contributes to a poor self concept is an educational issue worthy of research.

Summary of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to explore the effect of nonpromotion on the self concept of pupils in public elementary schools. Initially, letters were sent to two suburban school districts in eastern Montgomery County, Pennsylvania requesting their participation in a proposed study of nonpromotion in the primary grades. The two school districts agreed to participate in the research by permitting the investigator to work with all of the first grade classes in their school districts. The initial sampling encompassed eight individual elementary schools, twenty-seven classrooms, and five hundred eighty-five first grade pupils during the 1973-1974 school year. The pupils included in the initial sampling had never experienced nonpromotion.

The second year of the study, 1974-1975, included nonpromoted, borderline, and a random sample of promoted pupils still attending the selected schools. In

an attempt to highlight the effect of nonpromotion on the self concept of the pupils between the promoted and nonpromoted groups, an intermediary group of pupils labeled "borderline" was selected by the classroom teachers in May, 1974 (end of the first year of study) as a group of pupils generally displaying the same characteristics (maturity, achievement, attitudes, behavior) as the children recommended for nonpromotion, but for various reasons, were promoted to the second grade. In addition, pupils recommended for nonpromotion by the classroom teacher, but, nonetheless, had been promoted to the second grade, were included in the borderline group of pupils. The nonpromoted and borderline pupils were equated by (1) teacher judgment of their characteristics, and (2) mental ability as measured by the Otis-Lennon Mental Ability Test.

In order to confirm those pupils who had actually been promoted to the second grade and the pupils who had been nonpromoted in each school, the investigator conferred with the eight building principals during the summer, 1974. When the conferences were completed, the sample for the second year of the study comprised twenty-five nonpromoted, twenty-five borderline and twenty-five randomly selected promoted pupils.

The pupils' self concept was measured by a self-report instrument on four distinct occasions by the investigator. All pupils in the selected first grade classes were given the same self concept assessment on the following

schedule:

1. First Measurement . . . . . October, 1973
2. Second Measurement . . . . . May, 1974
3. Third Measurement . . . . . October, 1974
4. Fourth Measurement . . . . . May, 1975

Only nonpromoted, borderline, and a random sample by sex of promoted second grade pupils were included in the third and fourth measurements of self concept.

The test deemed most appropriate for assessment of the primary grade pupils' self concept was the FACES Scale. The scale is designed to measure the self concept of five to ten-year old children. Pre-testing data with the FACES Scale gave clear direction that the scale discriminated between low and high self concepts of primary grade children.

Supplementing the self concept data from the FACES Scale were two teacher questionnaires, a parent questionnaire and an in-depth, follow-up parent interview designed to highlight the effect of nonpromotion of the first grade youngsters in the study. The questionnaires secured facts and opinions bearing on the nonpromoted pupils' self concept and any effect that nonpromotion may have had on that self-image from the classroom teachers' and parents' perspectives. These questionnaires and the interview guide dealt only with the nonpromoted children.

The teacher questionnaire of May, 1974, assessed perceptions of the teachers who had recently recommended nonpromotion for these children. The second teacher

questionnaire of May, 1975, surveyed the teachers' opinions after working with the nonpromoted children for nearly an entire school year. The parent questionnaire and interview sought the parents' perceptions of their nonpromoted child's self concept as manifested at home.

The resulting data from the FACES Scale were examined by a two factor analysis of variance design, Promotion X Time, with repeated measurement on the second factor. The Promotion factor had three levels: Promoted, Borderline, and Nonpromoted. The Time factor had four levels: Beginning of the first school year (October, 1973), End of the first school year (May, 1974), Beginning of the second school year (October, 1974), and End of the second school year (May, 1975).

FINDINGS

The analysis of the data in this study has been divided into two major areas: (1) Quantitative Findings, and (2) Qualitative Findings. The analyses are presented under the following headings:

1. Comparison of Borderline and Nonpromoted Groups
2. Self Concept
3. Secondary Analyses
4. Discussion
5. Teacher Perceptions of Nonpromotion
   - A. Teacher Questionnaire at the End of the First School Year (May, 1974)

B. Teacher Questionnaire at the End of the Second School Year (May, 1975)

6. Parent Perceptions of Nonpromotion

A. Parent Questionnaire Near the End of the Second School Year (March, 1975)

B. Parent Interview (April, 1975)

The following summary of the findings derived from the research seems most germane to the purpose of this study which was to discover the effect of nonpromotion on the self concept of pupils in primary grades in public elementary schools.

Comparison of the Borderline and Nonpromoted Groups

1. With twenty-five pupils in each group, the mean IQ score for the Borderline group was 97.5 compared to 96.2 for the Nonpromoted group resulting in a t score of .40 with forty-eight degrees of freedom. The t score resulted in a probability of .691 between the Borderline and Nonpromoted groups which was not a significant difference.

2. With twenty-five pupils in each group, the mean chronological age in months for the Borderline group was 88.2 (months) compared to 85.0 (months) for the Nonpromoted group resulting in a t score of 2.67 with forty-eight degrees of freedom. The t score resulted in a probability of .010 between the Borderline and Nonpromoted groups. This was significant at the .01 level.

Self Concept

1. The predicted interaction of the self concept

scores for the three promotion groups over the two-year period was not significant.

2. The self concepts of the three promotion groups were slightly different at the onset of the study, but not significantly.

3. During the first (October, 1973) and second (May, 1974) measurement periods, the self concept scores were highest for the Promoted (15.2, 15.7), Borderline (14.8, 15.2), and Nonpromoted groups (13.8, 13.9) in that respective order.

4. During the third (October, 1974) and fourth (May, 1975) measurement periods, there was a change in the relative position of the three promotion groups. The Borderline group (16.1, 15.9) showed the highest self concept score with the Promoted (15.8, 15.2) second, and the Nonpromoted group (14.6, 15.2) of youngsters (repeating the first grade experience) ranking third.

5. The Nonpromoted group was the only promotion group of the three to have their self concept scores increase significantly ($P<.05$) over a two-year period.

6. The Promoted and Borderline groups had self concept scores which tended to decrease slightly during the second school year.

7. When all the self concept scores for the four measurement periods were averaged within each promotion group, it was found that the Borderline group (15.5) had the highest mean score.

8. In comparing variances within the promotion groups and within measurement periods, the Hartley test (F_{max}) for homogeneity of variance revealed no significantly different variances.

9. Hypothesis One: Overall, there will be a significant interaction between the Promotion Groups and Time. The predicted interaction between the Promotion Groups and Time was not significant.

10. Overall, the three promotion groups taken together across four time periods significantly differed ($P < .01$) from each other in terms of their self concept scores.

11. When the mean self concept scores were computed together for all three promotion groups within each of the four measurement periods, it was found that, overall, the time periods were significant at the .01 level.

Secondary Analyses

Because significant differences between promotion groups and measurement periods were noted, the remaining seven hypotheses were generally treated with an analysis of simple main effects. Where the hypothesis dictated a specific analysis, the Tukey HSD Test for honestly significant differences was used.

1. Hypothesis Two: There will be no differences in self concept between the (1) Nonpromoted and Promoted groups of pupils, and (2) Nonpromoted and Borderline groups of pupils at the beginning of the first grade.

This hypothesis was supported. No significant differences were found between the three promotion groups during the first measurement period (October, 1973).

2. Hypothesis Three: There will be no differences in self concept between the (1) Nonpromoted and Promoted groups of pupils, and (2) Nonpromoted and Borderline groups of pupils at the end of the first grade.

Because the three promotion groups significantly differed ($P < .01$) on the self concept scores at the second measurement period (May, 1974), the Tukey HSD Test was used. The Promoted and Nonpromoted groups significantly differed at the .05 level. The Nonpromoted group had significantly more negative self concepts than the Promoted group of pupils.

3. Hypothesis Four: The Nonpromoted group of pupils will show more negative self concepts than the Promoted or Borderline groups of pupils at the beginning of the second school year.

Because the three promotion groups significantly differed ($P < .05$) on the self concept scores at the third measurement period (October, 1974), the Tukey HSD Test was used. The Promoted and Nonpromoted groups significantly differed at the .05 level. The Nonpromoted group had significantly more negative self concepts than the Promoted group of pupils.

4. Hypothesis Five: The Nonpromoted group of pupils will show more negative self concepts than the Promoted or

Borderline groups of pupils at the end of the second school year.

This hypothesis was not supported. There were no overall significant differences between the three promotion groups at the fourth measurement period (May, 1975).

5. Hypothesis Six: There will be no differences in self concept between any of the four measurement periods within the Promoted group of pupils.

This hypothesis was supported. The main effect differences within the Promoted group of pupils between the four measurement periods were not significant.

6. Hypothesis Seven: There will be no differences in self concept between any of the four measurement periods within the Borderline group of pupils.

This hypothesis was not supported. There were significant differences ($P < .05$) within the Borderline group of pupils between the four measurement periods.

7. Hypothesis Eight: The Nonpromoted group of pupils will show more negative self concepts in the fall and spring of the second school year than in the fall and spring of the first school year.

Because there were significant differences ($P < .05$) within the Nonpromoted group of pupils across the four measurement periods, the Tukey HSD Test was used. The first measurement period (October, 1973) and the second measurement period (May, 1974) significantly differed from the fourth measurement period (May, 1975) at the .05 level

within the Nonpromoted group.

Discussion of the Quantitative Findings

At the beginning of the study nonpromotion was thought to affect the self concept of the primary grade child. Immediately following the fact of nonpromotion, it was predicted that the self concept of children repeating the first grade experience would be more negative than similar youngsters who were promoted to the second grade. The Borderline group of pupils was recommended for nonpromotion along with the Nonpromoted group of youngsters in May, 1974, by their classroom teachers. Their intelligence quotients did not significantly differ, although the Borderline group was significantly chronologically older than the Nonpromoted group. It appears that the one main criterion for consideration of nonpromotion by teachers at the first grade level is "immaturity". This tendency was corroborated by the teacher questionnaires in May, 1974.

It should be noted that self concept assessments are difficult to develop and validate. Jack R. Frymier, author of the FACES Scale, maintains that empirical validation of self concept measurement scales is very difficult, especially with young children. Inherent limitations of the FACES Scale may possibly have precluded the necessary discrimination between the Promoted, Borderline, and Nonpromoted groups of pupils.

The resulting self concept scores of the three promotion groups did not support the major hypothesis of the

study. A significant interaction of Promotion groups and Time was not found. In fact, after nonpromotion, the Nonpromoted group of pupils continued to significantly increase their self concept scores while the Borderline and Promoted groups slightly decreased, but not significantly, during the second year of the study. At the fourth measurement period (May, 1975), the self concept scores of the Nonpromoted and Promoted groups were virtually identical.

However, it seems clear that the fact of nonpromotion with the subsequent repeating of the first grade experience did not negatively affect the self concept of the primary grade pupils. A logical extension of this study would follow the three promotion groups throughout their elementary school years to ascertain any significant interaction in their self concepts.

It should be emphasized again that the three promotion groups, although not significantly different at the first measurement period in October, 1973, did, in fact, have self concept scores that almost significantly differed at the very beginning of the study as they entered the first grade, having never before been nonpromoted. A close analysis of factors impinging on a youngster's self concept development prior to first grade entrance may help to identify elements that are important with this phenomenon of self concept in younger children.

Teacher Perceptions of Nonpromotion

Classroom teachers who recommended nonpromotion for

the nonpromoted children and the second-year teachers of these youngsters were asked to express their opinions regarding the phenomenon of nonpromotion.

Teacher questionnaire at the end of the first school year.

1. The factor used most often as a basis to nonpromote for all four categories (boys, girls, blacks, and whites) was immaturity. Other factors listed as a basis for the decision to nonpromote in total percentage of ranked descending order were class achievement, poor social and emotional adjustment, chronological age, other factors, and poor attendance.

2. Overwhelming, the classroom teacher was the person listed as having considerable influence on the decision to nonpromote. The reading specialist ranked second (63.0 percent) as the most important person in the nonpromotion decision.

3. The child recommended for nonpromotion was listed as experiencing average popularity by the classroom teacher in 81.5 percent of the cases. A few pupils were considered unpopular (7.4 percent) and very popular (11.1 percent).

4. Nearly half (44.4 percent) of the children recommended for nonpromotion was rarely considered a discipline problem in the first grade classroom.

5. More than half of the pupils (59.2 percent) was rarely viewed as "withdrawing" in class while only a few pupils (22.2 percent) were seen "withdrawing" some of the time and fewer (18.5 percent) most of the time.

6. Nearly every child (92.6 percent) had a kindergarten experience prior to first grade entrance. Federally-funded Title I Summer Programs ranked second with 40.7 percent of the pupils having experienced this activity. Many more black pupils (72.7 percent) experienced the Title I Program than did white pupils (18.8 percent). Summer Head Start Programs were attended by 26.0 percent of the nonpromoted pupils.

7. The month of February was considered the teachers' foremost time for initial nonpromotion consideration. February (33.3 percent) was selected more than the next two most chosen months of March (14.8 percent) and April (14.8 percent) combined. January and November ranked third.

8. Almost half (48.1 percent) of the parents was viewed as receptive to the idea of nonpromotion for their child in the first grade.

9. Twenty (74.1 percent) of the twenty-seven children recommended for nonpromotion was viewed by their teachers as manifesting a positive self concept in the classroom prior to the fact of nonpromotion.

10. Teachers viewed the self concepts of the children recommended for nonpromotion as either remaining stable or becoming more positive during the first school year in 100.0 percent of the cases.

Teacher questionnaire at the end of the second school year.

1. The best accomplished outcome for the nonpromoted child after the fact of nonpromotion was greater readiness

for the next grade level. The second best accomplished outcome was greater academic achievement which was reported for twenty of the nonpromoted pupils (80.0 percent). Other factors listed as outcomes being best accomplished after nonpromotion in total percentage of ranked descending order were greater social progress, and greater physical maturity.

2. The nonpromoted child was listed as experiencing average popularity in the classroom by the teacher in 68.0 percent of the cases.

3. Nearly half of the nonpromoted pupils (48.0 percent) was rarely considered as a discipline problem in the classroom. Generally, girls appeared to be less of a discipline problem than boys, and blacks seem more troublesome in class than whites.

4. A strong majority (76.0 percent) of the nonpromoted pupils was rarely viewed as "withdrawing" in class while only a few pupils (16.0 percent) were seen "withdrawing" some of the time and fewer (9.1 percent) most of the time.

5. Twenty-one (84.0 percent) of the twenty-five nonpromoted children were viewed by their teachers as manifesting a positive self concept in the classroom after nonpromotion.

6. Teachers viewed the self concepts of the nonpromoted children as either remaining stable or becoming more positive in 96.0 percent of the cases.

7. Most of the nonpromoted pupils either experienced

only temporary emotional upset or none at all after the fact of nonpromotion according to the classroom teachers. No child was listed as having any emotional upset which was continually noticeable in the classroom.

8. Sixteen (64.0 percent) of the twenty-five nonpromoted pupils had nonpromotion listed as having met the child's needs, whereas, nine (36.0 percent) mentioned the fact that some further adjustments were still needed for the nonpromoted youngsters.

Parent Perceptions of Nonpromotion

Parents of the nonpromoted children were asked to express their opinions regarding nonpromotion on the basis of how nonpromotion affected their child.

Parent questionnaire near the end of the second school year.

1. In nearly half of the responses (45.9 percent) parents were strongly in favor of their child being nonpromoted. More parents (53.4 percent) strongly favored their sons repeating than their daughters (33.3 percent), whereas over a half (53.8 percent) of the white parents fell into this category in comparison to the black parents (36.4 percent).

It should be noted that of the forty-eight pupils who were recommended for nonpromotion in May, 1974, by their classroom teachers, only twenty-five (52.1 percent) pupils were actually nonpromoted in September, 1974. The above parental responses may reflect a rather skewed perspective

on the child being nonpromoted.

2. More than half of the responding parents (58.3 percent) stated that their child liked school more than the previous school year.

3. Again, over half of the nonpromoted youngsters (54.2 percent) were viewed as going to school more easily (without complaining) than last school year.

4. An overwhelming majority (79.2 percent) of parents viewed their nonpromoted child as being more confident and successful in school during the repeated school year as compared to last school year. Pupils' confidence and success in school were listed about the same in 20.8 percent of the cases.

5. Well over half (62.5 percent) of the nonpromoted pupils were perceived as being more happy youngsters during the nonpromoted school year in comparison to last school year. The remaining pupils (37.5 percent) were reported as displaying a general attitude which was about the same as the previous school year.

6. Most parents (79.2 percent) felt that their nonpromoted child got along at home just about the same during the nonpromoted school year as the previous one.

7. Nonpromoted pupils were described as getting along better with their friends (peers) in more than half the responses (58.3 percent). Nearly every parent (98.5 percent) saw their nonpromoted child either remaining the same or improving in their relationship with friends (peers)

after the fact of nonpromotion in the first grade.

8. Every parent (100.0 percent) described their nonpromoted child's self concept as being positive.

9. Two-thirds (66.6 percent) of the parents felt that their nonpromoted child's self concept became more positive during the nonpromoted school year from September to March, whereas, one-third (33.4 percent) of the parents believed their nonpromoted child's self concept had remained the same. Again, in 100.0 percent of the cases, either the self concept was seen as remaining stable or becoming more positive after the fact of nonpromotion in the first grade.

Parent interview.

1. The family size of the nonpromoted pupils in terms of children ranged from two to six children including the nonpromoted child. None of the nonpromoted pupils was an "only" child. Over half (58.3 percent) of the parents reported two or three-child families.

Overwhelmingly, the nonpromoted child lived in a two-parent family. Mother and father were reported living at home in nineteen (79.2 percent) of the twenty-four families.

2. All of the twenty fathers living at home with the nonpromoted children were employed. Seven fathers held white-collar type positions. The majority of fathers (65.0 percent) was gainfully employed in blue-collar type positions.

3. Seven families (29.2 percent) had a yearly income of more than $ 20,000, three families (12.5 percent)

grossed between $ 15,000 - $ 20,000 a year, while eight families (33.3 percent) earned between $ 10,000 - $ 15,000 for their yearly income.

4. The vast majority (~~80.3~~ 79.2 percent) of the nonpromoted families reported mother and father as married and living together. This was the situation noted in ~~twenty~~ nineteen families.

5. In only four cases (16.7 percent) was a broken family (including the single parent) reported. In all four situations the nonpromoted child lived at home with the mother.

6. Fifteen fathers of the nonpromoted children had graduated from high school while five fathers received less than a complete high school education. Five fathers were college graduates with one attending graduate school. Fifteen mothers of the nonpromoted children had graduated from high school while five mothers received less than a complete high school education. Four mothers were college graduates with two involved in graduate work at the university level.

7. Seven individual families reported one older child in their family had been nonpromoted once in the past. Thus, twenty-nine percent of the nonpromoted families had at least two children in their families experiencing nonpromotion at the elementary school level. None of the older children was nonpromoted more than once.

8. Five (25.0 percent) of the twenty fathers of the

nonpromoted children had been nonpromoted themselves in school. Two fathers were nonpromoted only once, while three fathers had been retained twice in their school career.

Five (20.8 percent) of the twenty-four mothers of the nonpromoted children had been nonpromoted themselves in school. All five mothers were retained only once.

9. Nearly all of the nonpromoted families spoke English as the primary language in the home with no secondary language being fluently used. One family spoke Portugese as the primary language with English as a secondary language.

10. Twenty-two (91.7 percent) of the twenty-four families reported that there was no stigma attached to the fact of nonpromotion for their child. However, a common, qualitative comment was made by many of the parents revealing initial difficulties in the beginning of the nonpromoted school year such as teasing, tenseness, and name-calling, but no lasting effect was noted by the parents.

11. Twenty-two (91.7 percent) of the twenty-four families stated that there was no noticeable neighborhood stigma attributable to the fact of nonpromotion for their child. Once again, after initial verbal teasing from neighborhood friends (peers), the situation improved with no lasting effect on the nonpromoted child according to their parents.

12. Of the twenty-four nonpromoted children, six (25.0 percent) were reported as a "first child" in the family, five (20.8 percent) were "middle children," and seven

were the "last child" in the family.

13. Twenty-one (87.5 percent) of the twenty-four mothers stated that there were no difficulties during pregnancy and in giving birth to their nonpromoted child. Three mothers (12.5 percent) stated that there were some difficulties for their nonpromoted child during pregnancy.

14. Most of the parents (91.7 percent) related that there were no major difficulties that their nonpromoted child experienced prior to first grade entrance. Twenty-two of the twenty-four parents mentioned that only the normal, minor-type problems of childhood were experienced by their nonpromoted children before first grade.

15. Twelve (50.0 percent) of the twenty-four parents mentioned grandparents as the first most important people in their nonpromoted child's life aside from their own parents. In three cases, older brothers and sisters were mentioned, with the classroom teacher listed only twice. Twenty (91.0 percent) of twenty-two people mentioned as the second most important person in the nonpromoted child's life were also family members.

16. The nonpromoted children experienced success in a variety of non-academic areas.

17. A majority (54.2 percent) of parents saw their nonpromoted child interacting with friends (peers) in a leadership capacity. These children were described as aggressive and outgoing by their parents.

18. Every parent (100.0 percent) thought that their

nonpromoted child would finish a high school education. Four parents (16.7 percent) mentioned trade school as a culminating educational experience. Fifteen (62.5 percent) of the twenty-four families thought that their nonpromoted child had the capabilities to complete a college education.

19. Thirteen (54.2 percent) of the twenty-four parents stated that their nonpromoted child's friends (peers) generally tend to be about the same age.

20. The hours spent watching television by the nonpromoted children during weekdays ranged from a low of 1.5 to 4 hours per day.

21. Parents were asked to respond to a forced choice of either "positive" or "negative" as being more indicative of their nonpromoted child's self concept most of the time at home. Twenty-one (87.5 percent) of the twenty-four parents responded in the "positive" category.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are based on the twenty-four nonpromoted pupils, their teachers and parents. It should be noted that in May, 1974, forty-nine pupils had originally been recommended for NP by classroom teachers, but twenty-five were not promoted.

The data and their analysis in this research provided the information for the following conclusions relative to the effect of nonpromotion on the self concept of primary grade children.

Comparison of Borderline and Nonpromoted Groups

1. The two groups of pupils, Borderline and Nonpromoted, do not differ in terms of mental capabilities.

2. Nonpromoted pupils are significantly younger in chronological age (months) than the Borderline group of

pupils.

Self Concept

1. Differences in the self concept of the three promotion groups were not associated with time and promotion classification when considered together.

2. The three promotion groups (Promoted, Borderline, Nonpromoted) differ in their self concept development before entrance into first grade, although not significantly.

3. Nonpromotion appears to have no effect on the self concept of first grade children.

4. Despite the fact of nonpromotion, the self concepts of the Nonpromoted group of pupils continue to significantly increase during the second school year even as they are repeating the first grade level.

5. Although never having been nonpromoted, the self concept of the Borderline and Promoted groups of pupils tends to decrease slightly, but not significantly, while in the second grade.

6. Overall, self concept development significantly differs across the four time periods for the three promotion groups.

Secondary Analyses

1. The self concept scores of the three promotion groups do not significantly differ at the beginning and end of the study. The self concept scores vary, but not in a significant manner.

2. At the end of the first school year ($P < .01$) and the beginning of the second ($P < .05$), the overall mean self concept scores of the three promotion groups significantly differ. The Promoted and Nonpromoted groups were significantly different at the .05 level during each of these two time periods.

3. Over the two-year time period, only the Promoted group does not significantly change their self concepts whereas a significant change ($P < .05$) does occur for the Borderline and Nonpromoted groups of pupils.

4. The Nonpromoted group significantly increases their self concept over a two-year period at the .05 level.

5. Within the Nonpromoted group, the first (October, 1973) and second (May, 1974) time periods significantly differed from the fourth (May, 1975) time period at the .05 level.

Teacher Perceptions of Nonpromotion

1. The factor used most frequently by teachers in determining nonpromotion was immaturity.

2. Classroom teachers clearly view themselves as most influential in the decision to nonpromote youngsters.

3. Nonpromoted pupils usually experienc[illegible] average popularity in the classroom prior to the fact of nonpromotion.

4. Most children recommended for nonpromotion at the first grade level do not pose a serious discipline problem for the classroom teacher.

5. For the majority of pupils recommended for nonpromotion, "withdrawing" in class is not a continual manifestation.

6. Nearly all the pupils recommended for nonpromotion have pre-school experiences before first grade entrance.

7. Teachers seem to consider nonpromotion for pupils by April, with February being the most popular month for this decision during the school year.

8. Most parents of the nonpromoted children agree with the idea of nonpromotion. However, it must be noted that of the forty-eight pupils initially recommended for nonpromotion in May, 1974, by classroom teachers, only twenty-five were actually retained in the first grade in the same schools. The vast receptivity of parents to have their child nonpromoted is only reflective of the latter twenty-five nonpromoted youngsters and their parents.

9. Children recommended for nonpromotion are seen by their classroom teachers as having a "positive" self concept.

10. Pupils recommended for nonpromotion in the first grade either have a self concept becoming more positive or remaining stable prior to the fact of nonpromotion.

11. The best accomplished outcome for the nonpromoted child after the fact of nonpromotion is clearly a greater readiness for the next grade level.

12. Nonpromoted pupils usually experience average

popularity in the classroom after the fact of nonpromotion.

13. Most nonpromoted children do not pose a serious discipline problem for the classroom teacher after the fact of nonpromotion.

14. For the majority of nonpromoted pupils, "withdrawing" in class after nonpromotion is not a continual manifestation.

15. Nonpromoted children at the first grade level are seen by their classroom teachers as having a "positive" self concept.

16. Nonpromoted pupils in the first grade either have a self concept becoming more positive or remaining stable after the fact of nonpromotion.

17. Nonpromotion is not strongly associated with any emotional upset for the repeating child.

18. Nonpromotion seems to be meeting the nonpromoted child's needs. Girls tend to benefit from nonpromotion moreso than boys.

Parent Perceptions of Nonpromotion

1. Most parents of the nonpromoted children are in favor of nonpromotion for their child at the first grade level. Again, it must be noted that of the forty-eight pupils who were recommended for nonpromotion in May, 1974, by their classroom teachers, only twenty-five pupils were actually retained. Therefore, this response may be a somewhat skewed perspective. However, the parents' receptivity of nonpromotion and the teachers' perception of this

parental receptivity were very consistent.

2. Most of the nonpromoted children like school better during their "repeated" school year.

3. Nonpromoted pupils go to school more easily (without complaining) during the "repeated" school year than the previous one in first grade.

4. Nonpromoted pupils experience more confidence and success during the "repeated" school year compared to the previous one.

5. Nonpromoted youngsters are happier in school during the nonpromoted year than the previous one.

6. Nonpromotion does not seem to affect the pupils' ability to interact among family members at home.

7. After nonpromotion, pupils seem to get along better with their peers than the previous school year.

8. Parents see their nonpromoted child's self concept as being a positive one, rather than a negative one.

9. Parents feel that their nonpromoted child's self concept becomes more positive during the nonpromoted school year.

10. Most of the nonpromoted pupils live in a two or three-child family.

11. Fathers living at home with the nonpromoted child are gainfully employed. Most fathers are blue-collar type employees.

12. In terms of total yearly income, most of the nonpromoted pupils live in comfortable family settings.

13. Nonpromoted pupils tend not to come from broken homes.

14. Parents of the nonpromoted children tend to have a high school education or better.

15. Some families have another child in the family who has been nonpromoted in the elementary school. There is also a tendency for one of the parents to have been nonpromoted once during their own elementary school career.

16. Language barriers are not associated in any way with nonpromotion.

17. Nonpromotion does not carry any family or neighborhood stigma for the children. After initial, minor concerns, there is no stigma attached to the fact of nonpromotion.

18. Birth orders of the nonpromoted pupils are varied and with no distinct pattern.

19. Nonpromotion is not associated with a difficult pregnancy or delivery of the nonpromoted child.

20. Most of the nonpromoted children see family relatives as the most important people in their lives other than their parents.

21. The nonpromoted children are seen as aggressive and outgoing when interacting with their friends (peers) moreso than being passive followers.

22. Parents expect their nonpromoted child to not only finish a high school education, but also college.

23. The nonpromoted children generally play with

friends of the same age or a little older and spend an average of two hours watching television from the time they return home from school until bedtime during weekdays.

24. Most parents see their nonpromoted child's self concept as being positive.

25. Parents feel that the fact of nonpromotion does affect the way their youngster feels about himself. They believe this effect to be a positive one. Confidence, maturity, readiness are characteristics ascribed to the nonpromoted child during the "repeating" school year.

26. Given the nonpromotion situation and decision again, most parents are in favor of nonpromotion for their child. Parents who feel nonpromotion is not a beneficial situation do not disparage the classroom teacher. The classroom environment, with accompanying discipline and emotional problems, is seen as the detracting influence rather than the professional.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the findings and conclusions of this two-year investigation.

1. Because the self concept of the borderline children slightly decreased at the end of the second school year, follow-up academic, social and self concept studies on those pupils who were recommended for nonpromotion by classroom teachers but, for various reasons, were promoted to the next grade level should be undertaken to ascertain any

long-range effects.

2. The self concepts of the three promotion groups (Promoted, Borderline, Nonpromoted) were almost significantly different at the onset of the study just following first grade entrance, therefore, a similar longitudinal study on the effect nonpromotion may have on the self concept of pupils should be undertaken beginning with pupils in kindergarten and following them throughout the elementary school years.

3. Because initial significant differences in the self concept of the three groups of pupils (Promoted, Borderline, and Nonpromoted) were almost found as they entered the first grade, a research study tracing the family history may prove helpful in the general area of self concept development and the factors that may cause a more positive or negative self concept prior to elementary school entrance.

4. A similar study should be conducted by a research team on a much broader basis. This possibility would include a larger sample of nonpromoted, borderline, and promoted primary grade pupils with foundation, state agency or federal funding.

5. Similar longitudinal studies should highlight the effect of instructional and ability grouping procedures in the primary grades on the pupils' self concept development.

6. Finally, by data from this study and a review of the related literature in an earlier section, it is

recommended that classroom teachers be made continually aware of the following areas in terms of self concept development and nonpromotion:

A. That the self concept and academic achievement may be associated factors.

B. The relationship of teacher expectations and pupil achievement may be related.

C. Boys and blacks are disproportionately the result of nonpromotion decisions in the primary grades.